



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,924	02/06/2004	Arthur Reginald Greef	M61.12-0574	8474
27366 7590 01/07/2009 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3244				
EXAMINER				
SHAAWAT, MUSSA A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3627				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/07/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/773,924

Applicant(s)

GREEF ET AL.

Examiner

MUSSA A. SHAAWAT

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to amendment filed on 10/20/2008. Claims 1-4 have been cancelled. Claims 5, 7-10, 12, 14-16 and 18-19 have been amended. Claims 19-24 are newly added. Claims 5-24 are pending examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 20 recite "a first computer having a memory ... a documents associated with the process template are related, viewed, and created", this limitation renders the claims vague and indefinite.

Dependent claims are rejected based on their dependency from a rejected independent claim. Appropriate corrections are required by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer et al., US Patent No. (6,125,391) referred to hereinafter as Meltzer.

As per claim 5, and 9, Meltzer teaches a computer implemented method of communicating between a first computer and a second computer, comprising: identifying a plurality of documents associated with a transaction; the first computer creating one of the plurality of documents based on the action sequence (see at least col. 3 lines 19-45 and col. 11 lines 1-25 and col. 12 lines 1-25); and the first computer sending the one of the plurality of documents to the second computer. Meltzer does not expressly teach defining an action sequence for the plurality of documents the action sequence defining actions that are performed on the documents and a sequential order of the actions. However It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of Meltzer to include defining actions that are performed on the documents and a sequential order of the actions, since Meltzer already teaches business interface definition that allows a customer to place an order by submitting a purchase order, which is in compliant with a document definition published in the business interface definition, in addition Meltzer teaches a document parser, at the document parser step the document is translated to the form of the host, for example XML to Java then the formatted events are passed to the router ... finally, the document is sent to a participant node (see at least col. 83 lines 30-45), in order to allow communication of documents flow between trading partner in an efficient manner.

As per claim 6 Meltzer teaches a method of claim 5 and further comprising: checking a version identifier to see if the first computer and second computer include

the same version of a process template related to the action sequence (see at least col. 84 lines 35-65 col.29 lines 25-55).

As per claim 7, Meltzer does not expressly teach process template. However Meltzer teaches a business interface definition (BID) that tells potential trading partners the service the company offers and the document to use when communicating with such service, in addition the BID allows customer to place an order submitting a PO compliant with a document definition published in BID and the BID allows the supplier to check availability by downloading an inventory status report compliant with document definition published in the BID of a business system managing inventory (see at least col. 2 lines 40-55), in addition Meltzer teaches an XML parser that parses the received XML document according to the document type definition which matches it, if an error is found then the parser sends the document back (i.e. requesting a copy of the process template), the Business interface definition acts as a compiler (see at least Col. 84 lines 35-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify Meltzer to include process template, in order to meets the need of business partners.

As per claim 8, Meltzer teaches a method of claim 5 and further comprising: rendering a document based on a set of rendering rules for each of the documents (col. 23 lines 55-60, col. 81 lines 35-40), wherein the rendering comprises making the document viewable to a user and wherein the rendering rules define how each of the documents is rendered in various applications (col. 23 lines 55-60, col. 81 lines 35-40).

As per claim 10, Meltzer teaches a method of claim 9 and further comprising: creating one of the documents based on a relationship between the first computer and the second computer, wherein the relationship between the first computer and the second computer comprises the first computer having a process template and the second computer having a copy of the process template (see at least col. 20 and col. 8, col. 11 lines 1-10).

As per claim 11, Meltzer teaches a method of claim 10 wherein the first computer is associated with a supplier and the second computer is associated with a customer (see at least col.2 lines 45-55).

As per claim 12, Meltzer teaches a method of claim 5 wherein the one of the plurality of documents is validated before it is sent to the second computer (see at least col.84 lines 35-60).

As per claim 13, Meltzer teaches a method of claim 5 and further comprising: integrating information in each of the documents into an application on one of the first computer and the second computer (see at least col. 8 lines 12-25).

As Per claims 14-24, the limitations of claims 14-24 are similar to the limitations of claims 5-6 and 8-13, therefore they are rejected based on the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In particular applicant argues that A) claim 14 has limitations that are not in claim 5, the examiner failed to make a prima facie case for anticipation as is required in rejecting the claims.

In response to A) the examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is reminded that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. Since the limitations of claim 14 are not positively recited they're given little or non-patentable weight, furthermore since claim 14 is an apparatus, the system of Meltzer has to only be capable of having a "memory including a process template, the process template comprising;the entity action module" as recited ion claim 14. Therefore Meltzer still meets the limitation as currently claimed.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MUSSA A. SHAAWAT whose telephone number is (571)272-2945. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8am-5:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Florian Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mussa A Shaawat/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627
December 30, 2008

/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627